

The Effects of Person-Organization Fit, Person-Job Fit, and Person-Supervisor fit on Work-to-Family Enrichment

Fusheng Zheng^a, SangWoo Hahm^{b*}, ^{a,b}School of Business Administration, Soongsil University, Seoul, South Korea, Email: b*blod@ssu.ac.kr

This study examined the effects of person-organization fit, person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit on work-family enrichment by using the person-environment fit theory. Furthermore, this study examined the difference in influences in these relationships. The results of this study showed that person-organization fit, person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit have all positive effects on work-family enrichment. Also, person-organization fit had the greatest effect on work-family enrichment, and person-supervisor fit was a greater factor than person-job fit. This study surveyed workers in Korea. Finally, 227 data surveys were collected and an empirical analysis was conducted. The purpose of this study is to clarify the role of the most environmental fit and to reveal the most important detailed dimensions to improve work-family enrichment. Furthermore, this study will explore which of the three is more most important.

Key words: *Person-environment fit, Person-organization fit, person-supervisor fit, work-family enrichment, work-to-family enrichment.*

Introduction

Work and family are two important areas of life where people are investing a lot of time, enthusiasm and attention (Burke & Greenglass, 1987). In the relationship between work and family, although individuals experience conflict and stress due to various roles (Frone MR, Russell & Cooper, 1992; Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian, 1996), many scholars recognize the positive aspects of work-family interface, such as enhancement (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Lapierre et al., 2018). Work-family enrichment is “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus &

Powell, 2006, p.73). It is a bidirectional concept that includes work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment. Work-to-family enrichment occurs when work experience improves the quality of family life, family-to-work enrichment occurs when family experience improves the quality of work life. Work-family enrichment has a positive relation to job satisfaction, family satisfaction and affective commitment (McNall, Nicklin & Masuda, 2010). Therefore, it is necessary to enhance work-family enrichment to achieve high performance and better well-being of employees. Individuals also prefer to segment or integrate work and family (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Kreiner, 2006).

Segmentation is meant to set up and maintain a boundary between work and family, and to separate it as much as possible. These people prefer to just work in their workplace and play a role in the family at home. Integration means eliminating boundaries between work and family and integrating factors of both domains. For example, this could involve talking about family at work and inviting colleagues home for dinner. Just as individuals differ in the degree to which work and family are segmented or integrated, workplaces also differ in the degree to which they create an environment that promotes segmentation or integration (Kreiner, 2006; Hochschild, 1997; Kirchmeyer, 1995).

If a workplace provides a working environment that fits the preferences of individuals, they will likely have a positive attitude toward their work. Positive influences from work can promote benevolence and behaviors that help others (Chen, Powell & Greenhaus, 2009). Thus, individuals will be more likely to use the positive psychological effects of work experience to increase participation and the positive impacts in the family domain. This study explains the role of person-environment fit as a way to improve WFE, and specifically to explain how person-organization fit, person-job fit and person-supervisor fit affect work-to-family enrichment. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to clarify the role of the most environmental fit and to reveal the most important detailed dimension to improve work-to-family enrichment. Furthermore, we will explore which of the three is more important. The focus of the study is on work-to-family enrichment because work-family enrichment is a bidirectional concept in which affected antecedents are different, and person-environment fit is a function of work-related attributes (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005), which will have a significant impact on work-to-family enrichment.

Literature Review

Person-organization Fit, Person-job Fit, and Person-supervisor Fit

Person-environment fit refers to congruence, match, similarity and correspondence between people and their environment (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). It occurs when an individual's ability meets the demands of their environment (demands-abilities fit), and also when the environment meets the needs of an individual (needs-supplies fit) (Kristof, 1996). Person-

environment fit can be variously divided according to the diversity of the environment (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). In particular, person-organization fit, person-job fit and person-supervisor fit are important factors of person-environment fit (Lee & Kim, 2016; Lee & Jeon, 2018). Person-organization fit refers to how individuals match the values, goals, and mission of organization (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001), which is a key factor in maintaining a flexible and dedicated workforce in a competitive business environment (Kristof, 1996; Bowen, Ledford Jr & Nathan, 1991; Farzaneh, Dehghanpour Farashah & Kazemi, 2014). Person-job fit refers to when an individual's knowledge, skills and abilities are commensurate with his or her job (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Similarly, a high level of person-job fit leads to positive results, such as job satisfaction, motivation, performance and organizational commitment (Farzaneh, Dehghanpour Farashah & Kazemi, 2014; Sekiguchi, 2007; Edwards, 1991). Person-supervisor fit refers to when an individual's values, personality, and behavioral styles match his or her supervisors (Van Vianen, Shen & Chuang, 2011). In the vertical relationship of the organization, person-supervisor fit is critical, as the supervisor exerts an important influence on the employees to achieve the organization's goals (Lee, 2009).

Work-to-family Enrichment

Work-to-family enrichment refers to the degree to which experience in work improves the quality of family life (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). A similar concept can be found in various studies including positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hanson, Hammer & Colton, 2006), enhancement (Wadsworth & Owens, 2007; Gordon, Whelan-Berry & Hamilton, 2007), and facilitation (Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004; Wayne et al., 2007). In the process of work-to-family enrichment, individuals have skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social-capital resources, flexibility, and material resources (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Skills means those associated with their work, including cognitive and interpersonal relationships, coping, and knowledge and wisdom derived from work experience. Perspectives refer to ways of perceiving or dealing with a situation. Psychological and physical resources refer to the positive self-evaluations, and emotions of the future and physical health. Social-capital resources are the relationships between people derived from work that can help them achieve their goals. Flexibility refers to the ability of individuals to determine timing, space, and location from work. Finally, material resources refer to money and gifts obtained through the work area. The process of work-to-family enrichment has two mechanisms which including an instrumental path and an affective path. The instrumental path occurs when the resources generated through experience in the work domain directly improve the performance of the family domain. The affective path occurs when resources from work improve the quality of family life indirectly through positive affective and performance.

Person-organization fit, person-job fit, person-supervisor fit and work-to-family enrichment

According to the person-environment fit theory, it has been found that the fit of individual needs and organizational supply affect an individual's attitude through the fulfilment of needs (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005; Edwards, 2008; Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006). In addition, individuals also prefer to segment or integrate work and family (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Kreiner, 2006). If an organization that provides a working environment fits the preferences of individuals, they will likely have a positive attitude toward their work. Positive influences from work can promote benevolence and behaviors that help others (Chen, Powell & Greenhaus, 2009). Thus, individuals are more likely to use the positive psychological effects of work experience to increase participation and positive impacts on the family domain. Moreover, the skills and values obtained in the work area through direct or indirect paths affect the family domain (Chen, Powell & Greenhaus, 2009; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Skills acquired in the work domain may directly improve the family domain when similar skills are demanded there; or indirectly through general behavior arising from the development of habits or scripts in the work domain. Also, the value associated with work might affect the family domain directly or indirectly through the value of general life. Therefore, if an individual perceives that his or her needs are fulfilled and match the values, goals, and mission of an organization, there will be more satisfaction and commitment with the organization. These experiences will lead to positive behaviors and attitudes and directly or indirectly improve the quality of family life. Likewise, if the individual perceives person-job fit and person-supervisor fit, positive experiences in the work domain will directly or indirectly affect the family domain. However, in the organizational environment, individuals have different levels of satisfaction with their organization, job and supervisor depending on the type of fit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Therefore, due to the difference in fitness, individuals will have different positive experiences in the workplace, and the effect on the family life will be different.

Hypothesis 1: Person-organization fit will have a positive impact on work-to-family enrichment.

Hypothesis 2: Person-job fit will have a positive impact on work-to-family enrichment.

Hypothesis 3: Person-supervisor fit will have a positive impact on work-to-family enrichment.

Hypothesis 4: Person-organization fit, person-job fit and person-supervisor fit will differ in the relationship between work-to-family enrichment.

Method

Sample

For this study, a survey of Korean workers was conducted and a total of 227 surveys were collected in order to conduct an empirical analysis. Of the 227 subjects collected, 117 (51.5%) were male, and 110 (48.5%) were female. In age distribution, the highest was those in their 20s (37.4%), followed by those in their 30s (27.8%), 40s (19.4%), and 50 and over (15.4%). According to years of service, 66 (29.1%) had worked 1-2 years, 54 had worked 2-3 years (23.7%), 24 at 3-4 years (10.6%), 39 at 4-5 years (17.2%), and 44 longer than 5 years (19.4%). According to occupational category, 118 were officers and managers (52%), 13 were sellers (5.7%), 41 were in production and sales (18.1%), 30 were in service (13.2%), and 25 were in others (11%). According to the child distribution, 137 (59.9%) were without children, 29 (12.8%) had 1 child, 56 (24.7%) had 2 children, and 6 (2.6%) had 3 children or more. According to position, 137 (60.4%) were workers, 31 (13.7%) were asst manager, 31 (13.7%) were chief of their departments, 14 (6.2%) were evaluated head of their departments, and 14 (6.2%) were executives or higher. Finally, 83 (36.6%) were in the service industry, 56 (24.7%) were working in manufacturing, 22 (9.7%) were working in trade, 6 (2.6%) were in telecommunications, 5 (2.2%) were finance and insurance, those working in IT were 23 (10.1%), and others were 32 (14.1%).

Work-to-family Enrichment

Person-organization fit was measured by 4 items using by Netemeyer et al. (1997). A sample item was “My personal values are well fit to this organization.” For measuring person-job fit, 5 items using by Lauver & Kristof-Brown (2001), such as “I have the right skills and abilities to do my job” were used. Person-supervisor fit was measured by Chuang, Shen & Judge (2016) using 5 items. A sample item was “My immediate superior and I are well matched in our values of life.” Work-to-family enrichment was measured by Carlson et al. (2006) and composed of 9 items. A sample item was “My work helps me to have various viewpoints, and also helps my family life.” We used the Likert 7-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree) to indicate the extent to which respondents agreed to each item.

Results

First, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to verify the validity of this study. As shown in Table I, the result of the analysis, all variables were found to be valid. The total variance explained was 66.988%. Overall, each factor was extracted with four factors according to the theoretical structure. The extracted factors were named as person-organization fit, person-job fit, person-supervisor fit, and work-to-family enrichment. The

items of pof4 was not loaded and removed in accordance with the theoretical structure. In addition, as a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's α of each variable was above 0.8 (person-organization fit= .861, person-job fit= .877, person-supervisor fit= .901, work-to-family enrichment= .930) and indicated high reliability.

This study also used confirmatory factor analysis to verify the fit of factor structure. In the absolute fit index showed $\chi^2/df= 2.304$, RMSEA= .076; in the incremental fit index showed AGFI= .803, TLI= .912, CFI= .924, IFI= .924; in the parsimonious fit index showed PNFI= .760, PGFI= .670. These results provide support for the validity of the measurement factors in this study (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Furthermore, the results of average variance extraction (AVE) of each variable was higher than .5 (person-organization fit= .646, person-job fit= .586, person-supervisor fit= .599, work-to-family enrichment= .582) and for construct reliability (C.R) of each variable was higher than .7 (person-organization fit= .759, person-job fit= .832, person-supervisor fit= .796, work-to-family enrichment= .886). Thus, these results provide support for the convergent validity within this study. (See Table II)

Table I : The results of exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis

Exploratory factor analysis					Reliability
KMO= .927	factor				Cronbach's α
	1	2	3	4	
pof1	.221	.199	.294	.776	.861
pof2	.429	.286	.194	.653	
pof3	.340	.156	.225	.762	
pjf1	.171	.082	.825	.115	.877
pjf2	.216	.076	.794	.099	
pjf3	.244	.074	.777	.102	
pjf4	.243	.249	.653	.293	
pjf5	.269	.190	.743	.131	.901
psf1	.236	.792	.194	.147	
psf2	.265	.775	.117	.138	
psf3	.202	.795	.173	.191	
psf4	.359	.740	.087	.173	
psf5	.228	.756	.073	.299	.930
wfe1	.681	.305	.220	.139	
wfe2	.665	.117	.231	.259	
wfe3	.698	.174	.204	.263	
wfe4	.672	.286	.183	.303	
wfe5	.696	.216	.173	.267	
wfe6	.750	.288	.128	.079	

wfe7	.711	.148	.254	.249	
wfe8	.778	.274	.291	.075	
wfe9	.711	.252	.260	.213	
Eigen-value	5.486	3.785	3.603	2.532	
Variance(%)	23.854	16.458	15.667	11.010	
Total(%)	23.854	40.311	55.978	66.988	

(pof= person-organization fit, pjf= person-job fit, psf= person-supervisor fit, wfe= work-to-family enrichment)

Table II: The results of goodness of fit for model

χ^2/df	RMSEA	AGFI	TLI	CFI	IFI	PNFI	PGFI
2.304	.076	.803	.912	.924	.924	.760	.670
			AVE			C.R	
Person-organization fit			.646			.759	
Person-job fit			.586			.832	
Person-supervisor fit			.599			.796	
Work-to-family enrichment			.582			.886	

Table III: The results of descriptive statistics and correlation analysis

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1	4.623	1.210	-			
2	5.066	.967	.534***	-		
3	4.456	1.244	.562***	.414***	-	
4	4.693	1.038	.678***	.589***	.627***	-

(1= person-organization fit, 2= person-job fit, 3= person-supervisor fit, 4= work-to-family enrichment)

***: $p < .001$, **: $p < .01$, *: $p < .05$

The following correlation analysis was conducted to understand the relationship of each variable. As a result of the analysis, all variables showed a positive correlation below a significance level of 0.001. In particular, Table III shows work-to-family enrichment is positively related to person-organization fit ($r = .678, p < .001$), person-job fit ($r = .589, p < .001$), and person-supervisor fit ($r = .627, p < .001$).

Finally, multiple regression analysis was conducted to verify the hypothesis. As shown in Table IV, person-organization fit positively impacted work-to-family enrichment ($\beta = .358, p < .001$), person-job fit positively impacted work-to-family enrichment ($\beta = .268, p < .001$), and person-supervisor fit positively impacted work-to-family enrichment ($\beta = .315, p < .001$). In

addition, the Durbin-Watson is 2.028, which is close to the reference value of 2, so it was judged that there was no correlation between the residuals. Hence, hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2, hypothesis 3 were accepted. Person-organization fit ($\beta = .358, p < .001$), person-job fit ($\beta = .268, p < .001$) and person-supervisor fit ($\beta = .315, p < .001$) also showed different influences in the relationship between work-to-family enrichment. In other words, person-organization fit had the greatest influence on work-to-family enrichment, second was person-supervisor fit, and last was person-job fit. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Table IV: The results of multiple regression analysis

Dependent variable: Work-to-family enrichment							
	B	SE	β	t	sig	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	.648	.246	-	2.632	.009	-	-
PO fit	.307	.048	.358	6.390	.000	.575	1.740
PJ fit	.287	.055	.268	5.261	.000	.696	1.437
PS fit	.262	.043	.315	6.043	.000	.666	1.502
$R = .773; R^2 = .598; \Delta R^2 = .592; F = 110.421, p < .001;$ Durbin-Watson = 2.028							

(PO fit= person-organization fit, PJ fit= person-job fit, PS fit= person-supervisor fit)

***: $p < .001$, **: $p < .01$, *: $p < .05$

Conclusion

Conclusion and implications

This study examined the effects of person-organization fit, person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit on work-to-family enrichment through empirical analysis and also examined whether there were differences in influence. As a result, person-organization fit, person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit all showed positive effects on work-to-family enrichment. This explains that person-environment fit is an importance predictor of work-to-family enrichment that can be achieved through positive experience in work when people fit with organization, job and supervisor. In other words, it means that when an individual perceives a higher level of fitness with organization, job, and supervisor, the quality of family life is further improved. These results are consistent with the results of Chen, Powell & Greenhaus (2009). However, Chen, Powell & Greenhaus (2009) approached person-environment fit as one factor. In this study, we examined person-environment fit in terms of organization, job, and supervisor dimensions. Work-family enrichment can improve performance in family as well as performance at work (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), so fitness should be considered in managing employees' selection, training, and job design in the workplace. For example,

whether to hire a new employee that is similar to the value of organization or training to fit the organization. Also, by assigning autonomy to employees through job design, they may acquire resources through work and ultimately enhance their role in the family domain. In addition, person-organization fit, person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit show that the size of influence is different in the process of influencing work-to-family enrichment.

Person-organization fit showed a greater impact on work-to-family enrichment than person-job fit, and person-supervisor fit, suggesting a strong relationship between person-organization fit and work-to-family enrichment. This result implies that fitness with the organization is the most important in the effects of person-environment fit on work-to-family enrichment. This is probably because person-organization fit is an important factor in maintaining the flexible and dedicated labor needed for a competitive business environment and a rigorous labor market (Bowen, Ledford & Nathan, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Sekiguchi, 2004; Farzaneh, Dehghanpour Farashah & Kazemi, 2014). Individuals are not randomly assigned to any situation, but rather identify an attractive situation for them (Schneider, 1987). Therefore, individual will stay in an organization when feel the attraction from the organization or have a good fit with the organization, and leave if they feel do not fit.

Also, Person-supervisor fit showed a greater impact on work-to-family enrichment than person-job fit. These results suggest that although Korean companies have traditionally emphasized person-organization fit (Choi, Jang & Kwon, 2011), person-supervisor fit has become increasingly important today. It is not only because supervisors play an important role in informing members of what they do in their jobs (Muchinsky, 2006), but also because they play an important role in satisfying employees' needs and ensuring that they have a positive attitude (Lee, 2009). Therefore, companies will have to make efforts to raise the level of fitness through hiring, selecting, or training to enable higher performance.

Limitations and future study

This study has the following limitations. First, data in this study was collected on a one-time basis and conducted a cross-sectional study that has limitations in interpretations of results. Therefore, a longitudinal study is needed in the future to more precisely explain the direction of causality between variables. Second, this study focused only on work-to-family enrichment in work-family enrichment, which is a bidirectional concept. In future studies, it is necessary to place more focus on family-to-work enrichment. Third, this study explored the role of person-organization fit, person-job fit, person-supervisor fit by approaching person-environment fit theory as a way to improve work-to-family enrichment. Future studies will need to study various antecedents from individual characteristics such as self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977); job characteristics (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Bakker, Demerouti, 2007); organizational characteristics such as organizational climate (Ostroff, Kinicki & Tamkins,



2003; Schneider & Reichers, 1983), supervisor support (Eisenberger et al., 2002) that enhance that role. It is also necessary to study the outcome variables of work-family enrichment. Finally, this study was conducted by a self-report questionnaire, but it is necessary to use various measurement methods in future studies to alleviate the problem of same-method bias.

REFERENCES

1. A. B. Bakker, and E. Demerouti. (2007, April). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 22(3), pp. 309-328.
Available: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/02683940710733115>
2. A. Bandura. (1977, April). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. 84(2), pp. 191-215. Available: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1977-25733-001>
3. D. E. Bowen, G. E. Ledford Jr, and B. R. Nathan. (1991, April). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. 5(4), pp. 35-51.
Available: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/ame.1991.4274747>
4. R. J. Burke, and E. R. Greenglass. (1987). "Work and family," in C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson(Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons, pp.273-320.
5. D. S. Carlson, K. M. Kacmar, J. H. Wayne, and J. G. Grzywacz. (2006, February). Measuring the positive side of the work–family interface: development and validation of a work–family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 68(1), pp. 131-164.
Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879105000448>
6. Z. Chen, G. N. Powell, and J. H. Greenhaus. (2009, February). Work-to-family conflict, positive spillover, and boundary management: A person-environment fit approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 74(1), pp. 82-93. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879108001152>
7. B. I. Choi, C. H. Jang, and S. K. Kwon. (2011, February). The effects of person-organization fit and person-job fit on organizational effectiveness. *Korean Journal of Human Resource Management*. 35(1), pp. 199-232.
Available:
http://www.khrm.or.kr/bbs/board.php?bo_table=articles&wr_id=586&page=11
8. A. Chuang, C. T. Shen, and T. A. Judge. (2016, March). Development of a multidimensional instrument of person–environment fit: The perceived person–environment fit scale(PPEFS). *Applied Psychology*. 65(1), pp. 66-98.
Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apps.12036>



9. J. R. Edwards. (2008, November). 4 person–environment fit in organizations: An assessment of theoretical progress. *Academy of Management Annals*. 2(1), pp.167-230. Available: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/19416520802211503>
10. J. R. Edwards, and N. P. Rothbard. (1999, February). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 77(2), pp. 85-129. Available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.716.5222&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
11. J. R. Edwards, and N. P. Rothbard. (2000, January). Mechanisms linking work and family: clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*. 25(1), pp. 178-199. Available: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.2000.2791609>
12. J. R. Edwards, and A. J. Shipp. (2007). “The relationship between person-environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework,” in C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *The Organizational Frontiers Series. Perspectives on Organizational Fit*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, pp. 209-258.
13. J. R. Edwards. (1991). “Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique,” in C. L. Cooper, C. L. and Robertson, I. T. (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Vol. 6, Wiley, New York, NY, pp. 283-357.
14. R. Eisenberger, F. Stinglhamber, C. Vandenberghe, I. L. Sucharski, and L. Rhoades. (2002, July). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(3), pp. 565-573. Available: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-01666-015>
15. J. Farzaneh, A. Dehghanpour Farashah, and M. Kazemi. (2014, July). The impact of person-job fit and person-organization fit on OCB: The mediating and moderating effects of organizational commitment and psychological empowerment. *Personnel Review*. 43(5), pp. 672-691. Available: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/PR-07-2013-0118>
16. M. R. Frone, M. Russell, and M. L. Cooper. (1992, March). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 77(1), pp. 65-78. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/21599770>
17. J. R. Gordon, K. S. Whelan-Berry, and E. A. Hamilton. (2007, November). The relationship among work-family conflict and enhancement, organizational work-family

culture, and work outcomes for older working women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psycholog.* 12(4), pp. 350-364.

Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5893240>

18. J. H. Greenhaus, and G. N. Powell. (2006, January). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review.* 31(1), pp. 72-92. Available: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>

19. J. G. Grzywacz, and A. B. Butler. (2005, May). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.* 10(2), pp. 97-109.

Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7911230>

20. J. G. Grzywacz, and N. F. Marks. (2000, February). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.* 5(1), pp. 111-126. Available: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-15533-010>

21. J. R. Hackman, and G. R. Oldham. (1976, August). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance.* 16(2), pp. 250-279. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0030507376900167>

22. G. C. Hanson, L. B. Hammer, and C. L. Colton. (2006, August). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.* 11(3), pp. 249-265. Available: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-08779-004>

23. A. R. Hochschild. (1997, July). When work becomes home and home becomes work. *California Management Review.* 39(4), pp. 79-97. Available: <https://search.proquest.com/openview/f899c02242364df834029e68c3e01df5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=42247>

24. L. T. Hu, and P. M. Bentler. (1999, November). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal.* 6(1), pp. 1-55.

Available: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10705519909540118>

25. K. J. Jansen, and A. Kristof-Brown. (2006, June). Toward a multidimensional theory of person-environment fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues.* 18(2), pp. 193-212. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604534>

26. C. Kirchmeyer. (1995, May). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assessment of organizational responses. *Human Relations*. 48(5), pp. 515-536.
Available: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001872679504800504>
27. G. E. Kreiner. (2006, May). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 27(4), pp. 485-507. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/job.386>
28. A. L. Kristof. (1996, March). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*. 49(1), pp. 1-49. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
29. A. L. Kristof-Brown, R. D. Zimmerman, and E. C. Johnson. (2005, May). Consequence of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*. 58(2), pp. 281-342. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
30. L. M. Lapierre, Y. Li, H. K. Kwan, J. H. Greenhaus, M. S. DiRenzo, and P. Shao. (2018, September). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work-family enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 39(4), pp. 385-401.
Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/job.2234>
31. K. J. Lauver, and A. Kristof-Brown. (2001, December). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of vocational behavior*. 59(3), pp. 454-470. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S000187910191807X>
32. J. Y. Lee, and M. O. Kim. (2016, September). Effects of person-environment (organization, job, supervisor) fit on the innovative work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior for office professionals. *Journal of Secretarial Studies*. 25(2), pp. 133-156. Available: <http://www.kass.or.kr/sobis/kass.jsp>
33. K. M. Lee, and S. G. Jeon. (2018, March). The effect of person-environment (organization, supervisor, job) fit on unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Korean Journal of Resources Development*. 21(1), pp. 79-105. Available: <http://www.kahrd.or.kr/>
34. S. H. Lee. (2009). *Organization & leadership*. Booknet, Seoul.
35. L. A. McNall, J. M. Nicklin, and A. D. Masuda. (2010, September). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business*



- and Psychology. 25(3), pp. 381-396. Available: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1>
36. P. M. Muchinsky. (2006). Psychology Applied to Work: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Cengage Learning.
37. R. G. Netemeyer, J. S. Boles, and R. McMurrian. (1996, August). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. Journal of Applied Psychology. 81(4), pp. 400-410. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228079311>
38. R. G. Netemeyer, J. S. Boles, D. O. McKee, and R. McMurrian. (1997, July). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. The Journal of Marketing. 61(3), pp. 85-98.
- Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1251791?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
39. C. Nippert-Eng. (1996). “Calendars and keys: The classification of ‘home’ and ‘work’,” in Sociological Forum, Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers. 11(3), pp. 563-582.
40. C. Ostroff, A. J. Kinicki, and M. M. Tamkins. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. Handbook of Psychology, pp. 565-593.
41. B. Schneider. (1987, September). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology. 40(3), pp. 437-453. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x>
42. B. Schneider, and A. E. Reichers. (1983, March). On the etiology of climates. Personnel Psychology. 36(1), pp. 19-39. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb00500.x>
43. T. Sekiguchi. (2004, January). Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. Osaka Keidai Ronshu. 54(6), pp. 179-196. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242307886>
44. T. Sekiguchi. (2007, February). A contingency perspective of the importance of PJ fit and PO fit in employee selection. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 22(2), pp. 118-131. Available: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/02683940710726384>
45. A. E. Van Vianen, C. T. Shen, and A. Chuang. (2011, October). Person–organization and person–supervisor fits: Employee commitments in a Chinese context. Journal of Organizational Behavior. 32(6), pp. 906-926.



Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/job.726>

46. L. L. Wadsworth, and B. P. Owens. (2007, January). The effects of social support on work–family enhancement and work–family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*. 67(1), pp. 75-87. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00698.x>
47. J. H. Wayne, J. G. Grzywacz, D. S. Carlson, and K. M. Kacmar. (2007, March). Work–family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management review*. 17(1), pp. 63-76. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1053482207000034>
48. J. H. Wayne, N. Musisca, and W. Fleeson. (2004, February). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to work–family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 64(1), pp. 108-130. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879103000356>